



**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



2.8 2.5
2.2 2.0

**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**

10



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions

Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

1980

Technical Notes / Notes techniques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Physical features of this copy which may alter any of the images in the reproduction are checked below.

L'institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Certains défauts susceptibles de nuire à la qualité de la reproduction sont notés ci-dessous.

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Coloured covers/
Couvertures de couleur | <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur | <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured plates/
Planches en couleur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées | <input type="checkbox"/> | Show through/
Transparence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Tight binding (may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin)/
Reliure serré (peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distortion le long de la marge intérieure) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments/
Commentaires supplémentaires | | |
-

Bibliographic Notes / Notes bibliographiques

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pagination incorrect/
Erreurs de pagination |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages missing/
Des pages manquent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque | <input type="checkbox"/> | Maps missing/
Des cartes géographiques manquent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Plates missing/
Des planches manquent | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments/
Commentaires supplémentaires | | |

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol → (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole → signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

The original copy was borrowed from, and filmed with, the kind consent of the following institution:



Library of the Public
Archives of Canada


L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de l'établissement prêteur suivant :

La bibliothèque des Archives
publiques du Canada

Maps or plates too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:

Les cartes ou les planches trop grandes pour être reproduites en un seul cliché sont filmées à partir de l'angle supérieure gauche, de gauche à droite et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Le diagramme suivant illustre la méthode :





OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

HON. EDWARD BLAKE,

Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada,

ON

THE IRISH QUESTION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, APRIL 20th, 1882.

OTTAWA:

Printed by MACLEAN, ROGER & Co., Wellington Street.

1882.

X

1882
(30)

HON. EDWARD BLAKE'S SPEECH

ON

THE IRISH QUESTION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

THURSDAY, 20th April, 1832.

Mr. BLAKE. If no other hon. member proposes to address the House on the subject, I do not, for my part, feel disposed to give a silent vote upon it. It is now two years ago since, in the course of a very important discussion here, I ventured to suggest in my place in Parliament that the accession to power which had then recently taken place of the Liberal Administration in England, would lead very shortly to the concession of some measure of Home Ru'e to the Irish people. I believed, as I said, that such a solution as could be obtained of the land question, such a solution as had been from time to time reached of other questions, would, after all, not settle the Irish question, and that unless the dictates of prudence and of justice alike were observed and fulfilled by the granting of some measure of control over their local affairs, we would see that which has been the disgrace and the humiliation of the British Empire for many years still continued. I also observed, as the hon. gentleman in his speech and in his motion has observed, that we had one amongst many material interests here, in Canada, in the solution of that question, in the change which might be expected from it in the attitude of the great bulk of the Irish people towards the Empire, that we had a material—although I regard that as a much lesser interest than the interest which has been mainly discussed—we had a material interest of a serious character with reference to the chances and the opportunity of immigration to our soil so long as the present state of feeling continued. Now, I propose to justify the attitude which I took upon that occasion and which did not then meet with any very animated response in the House or in the country; I propose to justify it by a reference to some obvious historical facts which it appears to me can lead to only one inevitable conclusion. In order that we may understand

the grounds upon which, as I conceive, some action in this direction is demonstrably necessary, it is by no means needful to go further back than to the time of the Union.

IRISH GRIEVANCES.

It is not needful here to recur in detail to the more ancient events in connection with Irish history, to the history of the conquest, to the history of the confiscations, to the history of the proscriptions, to the history of the penal laws, directed at one time against Protestants, and at one time against Catholics, to the history of these penal laws of the most serious and terrible description, laws and events to which I have briefly alluded, but which ought to make us all, when we recur to them, blush with shame, and which had left the marks of human error and of human crime almost indelible, and enhancing, there can be no doubt, even to-day, the difficulties of the situation. I say it is needless for the purposes of this discussion that we should revert to them in detail, for I am willing that this question should be tried not upon the history of the past eighty years, but upon the history of the government of Ireland under the present constitution of the United Kingdom. That history begins with the Union Act—an Act secured, as you all know, by means of the basest corruption. However beneficial the public men who carried that measure may have believed it to be, I do not suppose it will be urged to day that the end justified the means, and I have myself a strong belief that the nefarious means by which that measure was carried, operated very largely to increase the difficulties of its working and produced a state of feeling which gave it a poor chance of being satisfactory to the people of the country which was by such means brought into more intimate connection with the Empire. But, Sir, since that period, for a little more than eighty years has Ireland been managed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom and I do not hesitate to say that the result of that management has been a

DREADFUL FAILURE.

There has been time enough to try the question out. Eighty years in the history of a country, and such eighty years as Ireland has experienced, is surely time enough to try the question out. Now, let us apply some obvious, plain and palpable tests as to whether there has been a good and successful administration of Irish affairs under the existing system. The population of Ireland in 1726 was 2,300,000, in 1805 it was 5,400,000, and

that increase, more than doubling, occurred during a time of difficulty, of religious proscription and of emigration. In 1841, the population had abnormally increased under circumstances which it is not necessary to discuss, but it had increased to the number of 8,200,000. But since 1841 the history of Ireland has been a history of periodical distress, of famine and of emigration, and the result is that the population, which at the time I have stated stood at 8,200,000, stands to-day at 5,160,000 only, or 235,000 less than eighty years ago at the time of the Union, and 3,000,000 less than it was forty years ago. In the last thirty years, from 1851 to 1881, there has been an emigration from that country of no less than 2,750,000. Now, it may be said that

IRELAND IS OVER-CROWDED.

I deny that Ireland, as a whole, is over-crowded. There are parts of Ireland in which the distribution of the population is probably too dense; but I maintain that, judging by all the tests which we can reasonably apply to it, Ireland, as a country, is not an over-crowded country. The number of inhabitants to the square mile in France is 180; Italy, 225; Belgium, 421; Flanders, 718; England and Wales, 442; in the whole of Great Britain, 333; in Ireland, 161. The acreage of Ireland is 20,325,000 acres, of which there is at present arable 13,465,000 acres and an additional acreage easily made available for tillage of 4,000,000 acres more, making a total of land actually arable and available for tillage of 17,465,000 acres. How many acres are cultivated at this time—only 5,200,000; and this is the case with respect to a country of which the soil is indubitably very fertile, which has raised in times past enormous crops, comparing favorably in past times with crops at the same time raised in England, of wheat, rye, barley, peas, beans, potatoes and turnips, and no one doubts the capacity of Ireland for raising cattle. It has very great advantages. It has great quantities of bog land from which is produced a very cheap fuel, and which lands when reclaimed are inferior to none in the world whether as wheat or as pasture land. It has splendid coal fields, although these are hardly used at all. It has magnificent, perhaps unequalled fisheries in regard to the quantities of fish caught and harbor and other facilities in connection with the industry. It is possessed of valuable mines of gypsum, gold, silver, lead, copper and zinc. It has, besides, great facilities for manufacturing both as regards facilities for the transport of manufactured goods, for the supply of raw material, and for the cheapness of the labor to be employed. It

has, moreover, great water power, encouraging the manufacture of the raw material into the perfected article. It has a people confessedly very free from crime of the ordinary kind; a people which, whatever their prospects and chances and capacities may have been demonstrated to be in their own country, have shown in every other country than Ireland, that they possess the capacity to rise, and, by their industry, their ability and their force of character to take their own place in the world, wherever their lot may be cast. They are also a people confessedly affectionate, and grateful; and possessing, in a large degree, the organ of veneration, are easily impressed by any act of kindness shown towards them. With such a people, with such a soil, with such natural advantages, how does it come that we have such a result, with respect to population, as I have mentioned? How does it come to pass that the population of Ireland should have diminished instead of increased, that the emigration should have been so great, and that the condition of the country should be such as we know it to be?

THE WHOLE IS DUE

to the chronically wretched state of Ireland—its miseries, social, material and political. That is the reason why. Although there may be, although there has been, as we all rejoice to know, some improvement in the physical condition of some portion of the population during the last few years, this is to-day a pressing question, and no man holds that the condition of Ireland is satisfactory when viewed in those aspects to which I have referred. The condition of the people materially, in this as well as in other respects, is one which ought to create in all of us who call ourselves British subjects a feeling of shame. I say that the condition of Ireland to-day is due largely to the want of security and contentment, to the want of identification with the soil and attachment to the Constitution, to the want of hope of improvement and of bettering their condition, which is really the most essential thing to induce men to labor. I say that it is due to a feeling that their grievances are not redressed, to the lack of a feeling that their Government is conducted according to their needs and wishes, and to the lack of any machinery for the management of their local affairs. There can be no doubt that Ireland, at and before the time of Union, was subject to some great political grievances. There can be no doubt that those grievances were not of a sentimental character, but were such as to a large extent are to-day, acknowledged to be grievances which demand the attention of legislators, and should be redressed by legislation.

IRISH LEGISLATION.

If you go back over the history of the parliamentary government of Ireland for the last eighty years, and if you begin your enquiry by a reference to those great and important land marks or grievances, and should enquire as to the time when, and the circumstances under which, those grievances have been, so far as they have been, redressed, you will find a very good reason there, if you sought no further, for a deep-seated and justifiable dissatisfaction in the parliamentary government of Ireland, by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. There was the question—at that time as much a question of justice and of right as it was at any later time—of Roman Catholic emancipation. There was the question—at that time as much a question of justice and of right as at any later time—the disestablishment of the nominal church of the minority. There was the question—at that time as much a question of what was called here the lamentable question, but still in the condition of the country none the less a pressing question—of a proper measure for the relief of the poor, required because of the unnatural conditions that ruled distribution. There was a question of reform of

THE LAND LAWS,

by the creation of proper interest in the soil by those who occupied the soil. There was the question of creating local institutions to manage local affairs, and rendered very important because of the abrogation of the rights of the Parliament of Ireland and the transfer to Westminster of the management of those minute affairs which, up to that time, was under the control of the Legislature which sat in the capital city of Ireland. These leading questions, to which I have referred, have been in part—all but the last one, and that one has never been substantially dealt with—disposed of, and it may be asked, since such is the fact, why do I refer to them. I refer to them, because I see that the circumstances under which, and the time under which, those questions were dealt with, demonstrate more clearly than anything else can do, the unsatisfactory character of the Government of Ireland by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. When was the question of Roman Catholic emancipation dealt with? It was not dealt with until nearly thirty years after the time of the Union. Thirty years is about a generation, and it required about a generation for the Parliament of the United Kingdom to nerve itself to the task of dealing with that question. And how was it then granted? Was it granted them as the

boon of a cheerful giver? No, Sir. It was granted grudgingly and of necessity. It was granted, avowedly granted by the Ministry because

THEY WERE FORCED TO DO IT,

not because it was just, because they had been proclaiming to the ends of the earth that it was not just. Not because it was right, because they had been proclaiming that it was wrong. It was granted, because, as they themselves stated in Parliament, the question was between granting that concession and civil war. The condition of things had come to that pass that there was to be an immediate outbreak, a civil war, unless Roman Catholic emancipation was granted. Well, Sir, did that do good? Of course, you could not remove, even under such circumstances, a monstrous injustice of that description without some good being done; but I say the good was minimized by the delay which took place, and the attitude which was assumed by those who received and by those who gave that Act. The Irish people were taught that dreadful lesson, so far as the Administration of the Parliament of the United Kingdom could teach them it, that England's difficulty was Ireland's opportunity. They were taught this by the delay, and by the disposition with which those Ministers acceded to the grant. They were taught not to rely upon that constitutional agitation which is the proud basis of our system, and which every one is free to engage in, but upon other and worse methods of accomplishing by unconstitutional revolt. I say that no doubt something was done by the removal, even under those circumstances,

OF THAT GREAT BLEMISH,

yet nothing was done towards relieving, or conciliating the feeling of the Irish people, towards leading them to believe that they had a right to expect from the unconstrained sense of justice of the British Parliament the relief which they had a right to have; or towards obtaining those golden fruits which might have been reaped from a great act of justice cheerfully performed, in sufficient season. The next great measures of relief for Ireland—and I am dealing now only with remedial legislation—I am dealing with those measures to which the English Parliament may point with the greatest pride as marks of its parliamentary government with reference to Ireland—the next great measures of remedial legislation occurred, how long after? Nearly twenty years after. It was not until nearly twenty years had elapsed that we had the measure for the relief of the

poor to which I have referred, followed shortly by, and intended at the time to be followed as soon as possible by an Act for the sale of encumbered estates. The years, 1846 and 1849, are, I think, the years in which those two measures were passed; one fully twenty years after, the Emancipation Bill, and the other a few years earlier. These Acts, as I have said, were not of a late date, they were not the offspring of fresh institutions lately developed. They were the approach by the English Parliament, the Parliament of the United Kingdom, to dealing with old difficulties, and how again was it that they were brought about? How was it, that the public opinion of the British people and the opinion of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, was aroused to action, such action as was then taken in these two particulars? Sir, it was not the hand of the insurgent upon that occasion, it was not the hand of the agitator, so much as

THE HAND OF FAMINE

and of pestilence. It was not until the direst calamity which has beset the modern Christian world came upon us, and until a famine took place in which more human lives were lost than in all the wars with which England has reddened the soil of Europe or the world, it was not until that had happened, that the public opinion to which the House referred was sufficiently aroused to deal with this question. Such was the unhappy condition of Ireland, and the measure passed for the relief of the poor was a great boon to them. The Encumbered Estates Act, too, was greatly needed. It was hoped, however, that that Act would have had an indirect effect very beneficial to the tenants, but that hope failed. The condition of the tenants as a whole from the practical operation of the Act was not mitigated, because it happened that the sales of many of the lands that were sold under the Encumbered Estates Act were made to persons entirely new to the country, and who, in a great many instances, were wholly neglectful of and defiant of those customary—I cannot call them rights—but those customary favors which were granted by the former proprietors to the tenants, and the system of rack-renting and the other difficulties which might naturally be expected to grow from such an unnatural system as existed, were aggravated and intensified by the new proprietary; and so it happened that

DEMAND FOR TENANT RIGHT

became more—pressing as it was before—became still more pressing by reason of the practical operation of the Encum-

bered Estates Act. Well, Sir, about twenty years more elapsed before the next great remedial measure for Ireland was carried through the British Parliament. It was, I think, in 1868 the law for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church was passed, nearly fifty years after the Union took place. Now, who can pretend that that act of justice was not as much an act of justice at the time of the Union as it was at the date it became law. The principle on which the disestablishment was carried is immutable, eternal, and the question had been raised, as we all know, generations before. Public men in advance of public opinion of the United Kingdom and of Parliament—intelligent men, statesmen, had raised it, had pointed out that it was impossible that that establishment could be defended and maintained—had proposed that an act of justice should be performed, but it was utterly impossible to make progress in that direction. An old, old grievance, a grievance so old as to be almost out of date, a grievance of the most pressing character—how, I ask, was redress to that grievance obtained? Now, Sir, I shall give you an authentic account of how it came that Parliament and the people of the United Kingdom decided to remove that ancient grievance. I shall give you the account which the author of that great measure for Ireland himself gave in 1878 in the Midlotinian campaign. These are the words Mr. Gladstone used in explaining how it came about that the Irish Church was in 1868 disestablished and disendowed:

“Down to the year 1865, and the dissolution of that year, the whole question of the Irish Church was dead. Nobody cared for it. Nobody paid any attention to it in England.

“That is the nobody in England and Scotland, not the nobody in Ireland, nobody paid any attention to it in England. Then circumstances occurred which drew the attention of the people to the Irish Church. I said myself, in 1865, and I believe that it was out of the range of practical politics, that is the politics of the coming elections.”

Now, what was it that brought it within the range of practical politics; what was it made it possible to carry that measure of reform? Some new events, some new chain of reasoning that led to conviction on the part of the people that it was a just measure? I will read you what it was:

“When it came to this, that a great jail in the heart of the metropolis was broken open under circumstances which drew the attention of the English people to the State of Ireland; and when in Manchester policemen were murdered in the execution of their duty, at once the whole country became alive to Irish questions, and the question of the Irish Church revived. It came within the range of practical politics.”

That is the reason in this great measure of legislation by which the people and politicians of the United Kingdom

were led to the belief that the question was within the range of practical politics, and led to see what was their duty to the people of Ireland. Once again there was the same moving cause to the remedy. Once again there was the same long heart-breaking delay, and once again English and Scotch opinion would not act until compelled to do so. Once again, therefore, there was no meed of grace in the measure so obtained. It was forced from the British Parliament, and was so acknowledged, and therefore if it did remove the grievance it did not—as timely and cheerful legislation would have done, as any consideration of justice would have done—contain the element of grace and did not excite a feeling of gratitude in the hearts of those to whom the benefit was granted. Sir, that measure was a great measure in two distinct aspects. First of all it destroyed the pre-eminence of the church of the minority. It removed a crying injustice; it changed a condition which had combined the religion of the majority with their patriotism, a patriotism which, so long as it was the policy of the Parliament and people of the United Kingdom to maintain the church of the minority, was necessarily an anti-national patriotism. Besides that, there was the material gain that Irish funds to the amount of many millions were set free for legitimate and proper Irish purposes, not denominational, not sectarian, not for the minority, not for the majority, but for the whole people. Besides all this, the practical results of the disestablishment of the

IRISH CHURCH,

it had the indirect effect hardly less important. It was the first effective measure for giving to the occupiers of the Irish soil a great and tangible interest in the soil, and for increasing the number of Irish proprietors. The just provision which gave to the tenants, on church lands the pre-emption right to purchase those lands on moderate terms, a very small sum being payable down, and the residue being spread over instalments for thirty-two years, compounding principle and interest at a low rate, which made the annual payment not materially more than the accustomed rent, gave the tenants of church lands an opportunity of which they gladly availed themselves of becoming the owners of the lands they occupied. And thus it added no less than 5,000 to the number of Irish proprietors of the soil. With our notions, having regard to the figures I have given as to the population, you may say that 5,000 Irish proprietors is a trifle. What is the use of saying so much about 5,000 Irish proprietors? I admit that it is a drop in the bucket, but then the bucket

had very little more than a drop in it at the time. The total number of

IRISH PROPRIETORS

at that time was but 16,000; so that this measure in its operation added no less than 5,000, or very nearly one-third, to the number of Irish proprietors, and a measure which has such an effect cannot but be regarded as a very important measure of relief. Now, Sir, Ireland is a country of small agricultural holdings, and in considering this question, we must not forget that circumstance. There are in Ireland no less than 533,000 distinct farm tenancies, of which no less than 450,000 are under 50 acres, and no less than 50,000 more are between 50 and 100 acres, showing that the great bulk are under fifty acres, and no less than 500,000 out of the total 533,000 are under 100 acres. Although there are exceptions, as we know, principally in one of the provinces of Ireland, but also in the case of many estates scattered through other parts of that country, yet the bulk of these 533,000 holdings are yearly, and they are yearly in a country in which the custom has been that the tenant shall make the improvements, a custom which is wholly incompatible with the conditions of yearly tenancy. Now, Sir, while that is the number of

IRISH FARM TENANCIES,

let us see to what extent the ownership of farm lands prevails. In Ireland, one in every 257 persons, owns farm lands, while in France one in every eight persons owns farm lands; in central and northern Europe, the tenure of land is widely diffused; and while we have seen a very gradual growth and a very imperfect development, in the continental countries of Europe, of the principles of popular and responsible government—while in that regard they are far behind the United Kingdom, yet we have seen, since the days of the French revolution and the Napoleonic age, large advances made—much larger advances than have been ever dreamed of in England towards diffusion of the tenure of land, and the abolition of that most objectionable portion of the feudal system. In the Rhine Provinces, including Westphalia, there are 11,000,000 acres of cultivable land—and how many proprietors? 1,157,000 proprietors, or one to every ten acres of land; and if you read the history of the contentment and comfort, the work and labor, the energy and industry—the indomitable industry—that is displayed in many of these countries by the proprietors of these small areas, you must be convinced that the only thing that enables the Government of these countries to be

carried on at all, burdened as they are with enormous expenses, with an imperfect development of constitutional government, with great military armaments, and with an oppressive system of conscription and military service—the only thing that gives the people heart and hope, and enables them to struggle on at all, is that wide diffusion of the ownership of land than which there is nothing better calculated to promote the stability of the people, to whom the land belongs. Take the State of New York, in which there are 22,200,000 acres of farm lands, and in which the holdings are large, as is natural in a new country, where there is so much land undisposed of as there is on this continent. There the owners of the land, in 1870, were 216,000, against 21,000 in Ireland, including the owners of church lands. Look at two portions of Ireland, which may be selected as examples: take the agricultural counties of West Meath and Cavan, which comprise 1,360,000 acres, and in which there are 612 owners of less than 50 acres in that whole district; in the counties of Galway and Mayo there are 2,760,000 acres, and there are only 225 owners of less than 50 acres. The

NUMBER OF SMALL OWNERS

is insignificant in England, but that number is computed to be about ten times as large in proportion as the number is in Ireland, and that in a country of which I believe the greatest practical blemish to-day is its own land laws. I believe there can be no doubt that the greatest blemish in England and Scotland to-day is the condition of the ownership of land; but even there that difficulty was diminished relatively to the condition of things in Ireland. Now, Sir, there can be no doubt that the old penal laws, which among other relics of barbarity prohibited for a long time Roman Catholics either from owning or inheriting lands, had much to do with the creation of the present state of things as to the landholding in Ireland, and that state of things being once created and marked deeply upon the country, it became of course proportionately difficult to obliterate it. The result was a

PRACTICAL SERFDOM;

the people who cultivated the lands were only left with enough to subsist on in a miserable manner. All concede that there were many landlords in Ireland who granted proper leases, and behaved with propriety towards their tenantry; yet in the main, the practical result was that the whole profit of the lands, with the exception of a poor, miserable subsistence to the

tenant who worked them, went to the landlord, and also that where improvements were made, an early opportunity was taken to increase the rental of the lands to the extent to which they had become capable of producing, by virtue of the improvements which the tenant and his family had made. This was a state of things which of course did not merely diminish, but destroyed, that hope of bettering himself, which is the spur by which you can expect men to rise, and under the influence of which you can expect happiness and contentment to be diffused. The first or one of the earliest writers on the subject of land holding—Young, I think—says: "Give a man but nine years' lease of a garden, and he will turn it into a desert; give him a freehold of the naked rock, and he will turn it into a garden;" and I believe that not untruly represents the relative condition of things between the short holder under the customs that prevail in Ireland, and the proprietor. Now that situation would have been bad enough, if the rents so exacted from the tenantry were rents in any proper sense of the term; but the whole produce of the soil goes, not to enable the unfortunate people to clothe themselves,

BUT TO LIVE IN RAGS,

not to feed themselves, but to keep starvation from them, and above that the whole of the produce of the soil is taken by landlords who do not live in the country, because a certain measure of improvement and prosperity would necessarily have arisen from the expenditure on the soil by those enormous rents. But to make a condition miserable enough, God knows without it, still more miserable, the bulk of those who received these rents were absentee landlords; and so it happened that, speaking once again in the main, not merely a fair share and increment of the production of the soil, but the whole produce of the soil of Ireland, with but wretched livings for those who raised it, went away from Ireland—was rather a tribute paid by Ireland to foreign countries, than legitimately applied within the land itself, and which would have occasioned the development of trade and manufactures, which would have given more employment, agriculturally as well as otherwise, and produced some mitigating circumstances at any rate to relieve the darkness of the picture to which I have referred. I say it happened there was luxury for the

ABSENTEE LANDLORD,

misery for the resident tenant, as the rule, and that in a country of which it has been said, not I believe

rhetorically, but in sober truth, that if you wiped out the tenant's improvements you would convert nine-tenths of Ireland into a desert again. I have said enough to show that the question of the land is at the core of the Irish question, and to show how great was the importance of any measure, such as the Irish Church Act, which should have tended even in a moderate degree to unite the diverse interests of the occupant and of the land he occupied, and to create a land proprietary in Ireland. That measure was followed within a year or two by the Land Act of 1870. an Act which was, no doubt, a useful Act, and which was, probably, in effect, I have no doubt, quite as strong and sweeping a measure as the public opinion to whom I have referred, and the people of the United Kingdom would suffer to be passed at that day, but which in consequence of that public opinion not being sufficiently appreciative of the situation, was far behind what the necessities of the situation called for, and both the

CHURCH AND LAND ACT

were brought about, not from a sense of the need of either or both measures—were brought within the domain of practical politics, not because interested or selfish landlords or wealthy tenants had come to the conclusion, from some new turn of reasoning, that the condition of Ireland was one of injustice that required amelioration, but because a great gaol in the heart of London was broken open, and some policemen in Manchester were killed. That it was this that aroused England's attention to Irish affairs and rendered possible those measures of reform is beyond doubt, and again the same fatal error, and again justice and measures of propriety and prudence too long delayed, and again those lessons taught the Irish people, has borne for so many years such fatal fruits which as those to which Mr. Gladstone referred. That Land Act was useful in its way but it was not wide enough; the land clauses most hopeful in theory, which struck largely at the root of the question, turned out in practice not so useful as the land clauses with reference to the Irish Church owing to difference of condition. The truth was that in other respects the

LAND LAWS OF IRELAND,

as of England and Scotland were grievously defective, and the expense of a voluntary transfer of land in small parcels was almost prohibitory. The search for titles, and copies and conveyances and conveyancing itself were such

that whatever price you might fix for those moderate portions of land, which were the utmost aspiration of the occupant would in many cases fail to meet the expenses of conveyancing. That was one difficulty with which legislation was unable to grapple. There was another, in the want of sympathy on the part of the Treasury and other departments of the Government with those classes which savoured a little too much, in the then public opinion of the country, with a feeling of interfering with the sacred property in land—which looked a little too much towards a denial of the

DIVINE RIGHT OF LANDLORDISM,

which looked a little too much like a practical recognition of the motto that property has its duties as well as its rights, and it so happened in practice that there were but 160 sales a year on the average, or a total of 800, by the last return I have been able to obtain under the provisions of the land clauses of the Act of 1870. So, therefore, you will observe that the Act was wholly defective as a remedy for the evils complained of, and, which by experience, was proved to be wholly inadequate. Then, in 1880, the last Land Act was passed, under continual pressure, under similar pressure increased and aggravated by events; a great measure, but in itself not likely to settle the great question. I will not discuss the complicated details of that measure; but I will say that a measure which is based upon the ground and founded upon the reason upon which that measure depends, and which makes no provision at all for dealing with cases of arrears of rents—cannot be regarded as a final or satisfactory measure, if there were no other defect. If you look at the history of the ills which preceded that measure, and at the circumstances of the country, as stated by others, you will see that such a measure must be to a large extent wholly inadequate and entirely beyond practical application towards many, or most of the grievous cases that can be supposed to exist under it, unless it deals with arrears. The most grievous cases will be those of parties unable to pay their rents. However, no one can doubt but that that measure was an

IMMENSE ACTIVE RELIEF,

that it was a measure that gave more than was expected by many, or thought possible to be obtained from the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and nobody can doubt that it was obtained also from Parliament only by continued difficulties. The state of Ireland, as it had been, was becoming more aggravated still. Things were growing worse and worse before the adoption of the

last remedial measure, and the conviction at length impressed itself on the United Kingdom that something more must be done to remedy those evils. But the same fatal errors which attended the agitation for the introduction of the previous remedial measures, attended this. It came so late that a large portion of the benefit, so far as feeling was concerned, and so far as the conviction that Ireland could depend on the justice of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, that there was any prospect of an ending to their sufferings, that this last remedial measure had wholly lost its grace. I say it is as plain as the day that true statesmanship pointed to earlier action, to action under other and different circumstances when a measure, even less thorough going than this one, would have produced an amelioration in the condition and temper of the people of this country, much greater than could be expected from the measure brought in and carried at the time, and under the circumstances and under the pressure which attended its being carried. That is the record of eighty years of

REMEDIAL LEGISLATION FOR IRELAND.

These are the important land marks of the acts for the remedy of wrongs, and the delay of justice that have distinguished British legislation in the past eighty years. There are others, no doubt, subsidiary acts; it did not take quite so long—I forget whether more than a couple of Parliaments—to induce the Parliament of the United Kingdom to pass a Sunday closing Act, which was demanded by the unanimous voice of the Irish population, and was applicable to them only, but which did not agree with the sentiments of the British publican, and which, therefore, it was thought wrong to give to the Irish people. But, it came at last, and minor measures of this description have come to Ireland from time to time, but the large and important measures of statesmanship which had agitated the public mind are those to which I have referred, and which have been accomplished only after the delays and under the circumstances I have briefly stated. Can anybody wonder then that there should have grown up early, and that there should continue with an ever increasing volume and urgency, a cry for

A MEASURE OF HOME RULE.

Put the question to ourselves. If we had been for eighty years in the position that these people have been in for that time; if we had to agitate for one generation for

one measure of justice, for three-quarters of a generation for the next measure, and two-thirds of a generation for the third; if as each of these measures had been obtained, it was due not to the recognition of the justness of our cause, but to the recognition of the danger of further delay, what would have been our feelings and how earnestly we would have demanded some portion of control over our affairs. But there is a darker side to the picture than that. While remedies were refused, force was at the same time constantly applied. While you have the miserable record of remedial Acts to which I have referred, you have the record of Arms Acts, Coercion Acts, Restraint of the Press Acts, Suspension of Habeas Corpus Acts, and all those legislative means of coercing the people passed from time to time with the utmost freedom by the same Parliament which was denying and delaying what is now admitted to have been only justice to the people. I do not mean to say that the conduct of the Irish people—a large portion of it—under these circumstances was justifiable. Far from it, I do not mean to say that it might not have been necessary sometimes to pass these Acts.

TRUE FRIENDS OF IRELAND

have, from time to time, concurred in their passage, but I do mean to say that the condition of things lasting for eighty years, with such a record on its brighter side of remedial legislation and such a record on its darker side of coercive legislation, is a record that proves that the experiment of Local Government for Ireland by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, has been a disastrous failure. Besides, legislative coercion, there were other methods of coercion employed. There is an army under the guise of a constabulary, of 12,000 or 13,000 of, I suppose, the best troops in the world, the Irish Constabulary, and we have had from time to time large portions of the military forces of the Empire quartered in Ireland. From time to time not less than 50,000 men—I believe to-day not less than 50,000 men of the British army are stationed in Ireland to keep the people down, and large detachments of the British fleet frequent Irish harbors for the same purpose. Whether right or wrong in this controversy it cannot be contended that the Government of Ireland for eighty years has been a Government by constitutional means, but it must be admitted that it is a Government by force. That is the large result of the whole business. Now it is acknowledged—as the hon. member for Victoria has said—freely and frankly acknowledged—that Ireland

was being misgoverned all these years. What a humiliating condition is that which the

MOTHER OF PARLIAMENTS,

the mother of constitutional freedom throughout the world, occupies on this question. Which of us did not feel with a pang of humiliation the keen shaft of the satirist, who forged, so to speak, the letter from the Sultan of Turkey, not long since calling, in response to some calls that had been made in England on him to remedy some grievances of his subjects, on the British Government to remedy the condition of the Irish people. Who did not feel that such a letter might have been fairly written, that such a complaint might have been fairly made, and that the argument sometimes urged in this House of *tu quoque* might have been fairly used. Of these resolutions it is needless to speak. No doubt Ireland is largely in a state of anarchy, ruled as far as the Kingdom is concerned, mainly by force, mainly by, so far as a large portion of the people is concerned, an organization without and beyond the control of the law, and I mention that it is the delays which have taken place in their passage and the circumstances under which these measures of pressing justice and importance have been at length gradual, which are responsible for the distressed condition of that country. There were, for these delays, two reasons: Reformers, and I do not use the word in a party sense, or as defining wholesale the Reform party of England, as compared with the Conservative party, though I might so use it—but still there have been

HONORABLE EXCEPTIONS

in the Conservative party—Reformers, in the larger sense of the term, have from time to time pressed upon the public and upon Parliament, long before these reforms were granted, their justice and necessity; but the great body of public opinion was unquestionably hostile to Ireland. By a Parliament of the United Kingdom, in which the opinion of the majority must rule—it was impossible, under the constitutional system, that that justice or expediency, by which the majority were not alive, could be pushed forward. I believe that long ago many of these measures would have been carried by far-sighted statesmen, except that they felt it was impossible to carry them, except that they were, as Mr. Gladstone has put it, beyond the realm of practical politics, because the aristocratic, the large land holding interest, the Conservative

interest, and many other interests were entirely too strong to enable the relatively small band of advanced Reformers free to carry them at all. In a word the public opinion of the United Kingdom did not recognize the importance of it, and was not sufficiently advanced to discharge the duties of efficiently managing Irish affairs. The second difficulty was the want of time. Parliament was overweighted with its concerns, it had to deal with

LARGE IMPERIAL CONCERNS,

it had to deal with local concerns which were supposed to be more pressing, and it was unequal to its task. We know that for a great many years Parliament has been unequal to its task in that regard. We know that measures have been brought in by strong Governments Session after Session and have been just crushed out by the pressure of other affairs, have not been reached. It takes years as a rule before that which is deemed sufficiently ripe for legislation to be actually brought into Parliament by a Government on its responsibility, can reach that stage of discussion, unless there be some extraordinary reason of urgency such as lately attended the discussion of the Irish question. It has so happened that men have been too apt to say with reference to the large questions to which I have referred, and which have been settled: "Oh, that question is not yet within the range of practical politics," just as Mr. Gladstone said on the Irish question in 1865, and so they say of those questions until gunpowder, murder, assassination explosions, a condition of chronic disaffection breaking out in some particular manner, brings them to the conclusion forthwith that the question is within the range of practical politics and has got to be dealt with. Now, I say that even if Parliament could now take up what it ought long ago to have taken up, we might hope it would be dealt with, but it also was dealt with so late as to obviate all chance of its settlement being concurrent with a resolution of better feeling between the people of the two countries, and thus it is that I am brought to the conclusion that it is the duty of every man who entertains a strong feeling for the Empire, who entertains a feeling of pride in its glories and of shame in its failures and its faults, to do what he can in his sphere towards pressing forward this Irish question to a solution while there yet be time. Now, so long ago as 1878 the statesman to whom I referred a while ago, Mr. Gladstone, spoke in this manner, prior to the General Election which took place at that time :

"In the matter of Local Government there may be a solution of some national and even Imperial difficulties. * * * If you ask me what I think of Home Rule I must tell you that I will only answer you when you tell me how Home Rule is related to Local Government. I am friendly to Local Government, I am friendly to large local privileges and power, and desire, I may almost say, I intensely desire to see Parliament relieved of some portion of its duties. I see the efficiency of Parliament interfered with, not only by obstruction from Irish members, but even more grossly by the enormous weight which is placed upon the time and minds of those whom you have sent to represent you. We have got an overweighted Parliament, and if Ireland or any other portion of the country is desirous and able to arrange its affairs, that by taking the local part or part of its transactions off the hands of Parliament, it can liberate and strengthen Parliament for Imperial concerns, I say I will not only accord a reluctant assent, but I will give a generous support to any such scheme.

"One limit, gentlemen, one limit only, I know to the extension of colonial Government, it is this, nothing can be done in my opinion by any wise statesman or right-minded Briton to weaken the authority of the Imperial Parliament. Because the Imperial Parliament must be Imperial in the three Kingdoms, nothing that creates a doubt upon that supremacy can be tolerated by any intelligent and patriotic man. But subject to that limitation if we can make arrangements under which Ireland, Scotland, Wales and a portion of England, can deal with questions of local and special interest to themselves more effectually than Parliament now can, that, I say, will be the attainment of a great national good. The Scotch members who always show in Parliament—I must say, speaking of them as an average, and perhaps it is all the more true because the majority of them are Liberal—who always show in the transaction of Scotch business remarkable shrewdness and efficiency, yet all find cause to complain and complain seriously and gravely, that they cannot get the Scotch business properly transacted.

"The Parliament is over-weighted. The Parliament is almost overwhelmed. If we could take off its shoulders that superfluous weight by the constitution of secondary and subordinate authorities. I am not going to be frightened out of a wise measure of this kind by being told that I am condescending to the prejudices of the Home Rulers. I will condescend to no such prejudices. I will consent to give to Ireland upon principle nothing that is not upon equal terms offered to Scotland and to the different portions of the United Kingdom. But I say that the man who starts to devise a machinery by which some portion of the excessive and impossible task, now laid upon the House of Commons, shall be shifted to the more free and therefore more efficient hands of secondary and local authority will confer a blessing upon this country, that will entitle him to be ranked among the prominent benefactors of the land."

I think Sir, having regard to that speech, I was justified in hailing the accession to power of the Liberal party, as I did in the year 1880, as giving an omen of some measure of redress for Ireland in this particular. But Sir, another speech was delivered by that same statesman, under the responsibility of office, in the Imperial House of Commons, not very long ago, in which he once again recurred to this subject and said:

"We attach great value," said Mr. Gladstone, "to the extension, perhaps I should say to the establishment—(hear, hear)—of the principles of Local Government in Ireland. We believe that one of the great evils under which Ireland labors is the want of local administration, and a more central system of authority. We believe that the

state of Ireland never can be satisfactory until its people have acquired and learned by tradition and practice to exercise those powers of Local Government which were so beneficial in other portions of the Empire. Moreover, we believe that were the Irish people had the opportunity within a limited range of giving proof of their powers and qualities and capabilities for Local Government, as they have done under the Poor Law Acts and through some other channels, they have administered well. Indeed, no one can doubt that, or their perfect capacity for such a duty. But this is speaking on the question of purely local administration. The motion of my honorable friend embraces matters of wider scope. I wish to point out to those honorable gentlemen that neither they, nor so far as I know Mr. Butt before them, nor so far as I know Mr. O'Connell before him, ever distinctly explained in an intelligent and practical form the manner in which the real knot of this question was to be untied. The principle on which they profess to proceed is that purely Irish matters are to be dealt with by a purely Irish authority, Imperial matters to be left to the Imperial authority of a Chamber in which Ireland is to be represented. But they have not told us by what authority it is to be determined which matters taken one by one are Irish, and which matters are Imperial. Until they lay before the House a plan in which they go to the very bottom of the question, and give us to understand in what manner that division is to be accomplished, the practical consideration of this subject cannot really be arrived at, and I know not how any effective judgment upon it can be pronounced. I am well convinced that neither this Parliament nor any other House of Commons will at any time assent to any measure by which the one paramount centre of authority necessary for holding together in perfect unanimity and compactness this great Empire can possibly be in the slightest degree impaired. (Ministerial and Opposition cheers.) We are entitled and bound to ask a clear and explicit explanation as to the mode in which that vital matter is to be determined. Who is to say what purposes are Imperial? Who is to determine the circumscription within which the Irish authority is to have a final voice? Quotations have been made in reference to the positions of other countries—for example, Finland in relation to Russia. But this affords no practical illustration of the matter. It would be just as rational for those gentlemen to quote the case of the Channel Islands. With regard to the Isle of Man, we have sometimes interfered in the matter of Custom duties, but not in my recollection have we interfered in the legislation of the Channel Islands. We have left it entirely to their own authority, and we have not felt any inconvenience flow from that arrangement. Thus while some development is given to the principle of Local Government without any practical inconvenience, I think the case of Finland and Russia is not different from the case presented by England and the Channel Islands. The case of Austria and Hungary has also been cited. I fully grant that the magnitude of that case is such that if you can, by the development of that case, show it affords a precedent for us, you certainly make out a strong case. I have heard of the alleged and the great and paramount difficulty of this question to which I have just referred, namely, the establishment of a dividing and a divided authority—as in the case of the Austro-Hungarian Empire—by a reference of the matter to the personal authority of the Sovereign. If that be so, am I really to understand that it is the proposal of those members of this House who take the view I am now referring to that the personal authority of a Sovereign in this country is to decide the question of what subjects are to be referred to the Parliament of Ireland and what subjects are to be referred to the Imperial Parliament of this country. If that is the doctrine held, then I say you are immediately involved in a dilemma more hopeless than any that has presented itself to you, because on the one hand the subjects are to be decided on the authority of responsible Ministers, or on the other hand by a personal will or whim. If the decision is to be determined on the authority of responsible Ministers—the responsible Ministers of Great Britain or the respon-

able Ministers of Ireland who are to exist under the plan that is now proposed (hear, hear), evidently you can't refer to the responsible Ministers of Great Britain the power of drawing a distinction which involves the most vital, delicate and practical parts of the subject. Then, if in the highest and nicest matter of Government you are going again to set up the personal responsibility of the Sovereign apart from the advice of responsible Ministers, you are at once proposing a revolution in this country more profound than you need bring about by the establishment of any form of Government whatever. (Hear, hear.) I express for myself, and I am sure for my colleagues, that we are most favorable to the introduction of a rightly understood principle of Local Government in Ireland, and most desirous to promote it. For the first of the purposes they have in view they cannot take the first step, they cannot establish one foot of ground upon which and from which to address their arguments to the House of Commons, until they have proposed a plan in which it shall be clearly set forth by what authority, by what machinery, they mean to divide Imperial and local questions, and so to give satisfaction to the members of this House upon its first and most paramount duty, namely, the maintaining of the supremacy of the Imperial authority for every practical purpose relating to the interests and the purposes of this great Empire." (Cheers.)

Now, Sir, in that speech, while announcing once again his adhesion to the principle of Local Government, that great statesman has endeavored to shift from the shoulders of the responsible Government of the Empire to the shoulders of those who are in a hopeless minority, a question which belongs to that Government to solve. I say that it belongs to those who are responsible for the good government of the Empire, who have the majority, who have the power, who can initiate legislation themselves to grapple with the difficulty. I say that those who admit that the present system is unjust, who admit that the present condition of Ireland cannot be satisfactory without some change, who acknowledge that a change can be made, are in an untenable position when they tell the minority: "Gentlemen, come forward, propound some plan, solve every difficulty, tell us how you would settle this question, and until you do that we are not called upon to act." That is not, in my opinion, language worthy of any statesman, be he Conservative or Reformer. It is not upon such statements that the Irish question can be settled. It would be folly to blink the consideration that any measure that Mr. Gladstone may propose on this question would be unsatisfactory to many, and at any rate it would not be accepted by the Irish people as a final settlement of the question. But I maintain that the longer you delay, the greater the difficulties, and I maintain that though the proposition you are able to propose may not be satisfactory to all, it is no ground whatever for declining to do that which you yourself acknowledged it is just should be done. True justice will do that which is right, and will give that measure for relief which it knows is just, and which believe it will give that added measure of safety and security which will result from

the changed state of affairs. What is the state of affairs? The Prime Minister of England says the condition of Ireland is unsatisfactory, because the Irish people have not the measure of Local Government which they ought to have, and he says: "I will not give that measure of Local Government to you; I will not stir hand or foot in the matter until the Irish members in the House of Commons, who are in the minority, and are powerless to do anything, shall propose a measure which shall be satisfactory to themselves, and that they will undertake to deal with this complicated and exacerbadated question, so full of difficulties and in the light of all the errors and circumstances of the past.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. I will not engage in a discussion of the various hypothetical cases and somewhat strained difficulties which it seems to me are dealt with in that speech on that question. I frankly admit that the division power, local and federal is one of them; but how there can be a difficulty in deciding how that is to be regulated and in determining how it is to be regulated by a general Act of justice, I cannot at all see. There can be no doubt whatever that the difficulty which occurred to the Prime Minister on this occasion, was the view which he has entertained and expressed so freely and which is that same difficulty which has prevented justice being done to Ireland in former years and under other circumstances; it is the difficulty of having to deal with a recalcitrant and inert mass of public opinion not sufficiently advanced to enable him to grapple with the subject. To him I believe the words of the great poet of the adjoining republic apply when he says:

"His statecraft was the golden rule,
His right of vote a sacred trust,
Clear above threat and ridicule,
All heard his challenge 'Is it just?'"

I believe that a love of justice and of generous and liberal treatment is an instinct I might say of that statesman's nature; but he must be sustained, his hands must be held up in order to give him the power to accomplish the task which, though advanced in years, remains for him to do in order to crown a life spent in the service of his country. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution (Mr. Costigan) said that Scotland was also moving on the subject. Within the last ten days a very important meeting was held which came to the conclusion to ask for a Local Legislature for Scotland with triennial elective Parliaments; and there can

be no doubt, notwithstanding the remarkable business tact and talent by which the Scotch business has been managed in Parliament, there have been great and injurious effects in the management of that business. What has been accomplished, has been accomplished by a sort of imperfect federation in that regard. We know that, in regard to all parliamentary measures, the Scotch members have met together and agreed as to what was wanted for the country, and what was agreed upon has been passed through Parliament, unless it trenchd upon the prejudices and views of others almost without debate. They have not succeeded in all things—they have not succeeded in many important things. They have had strong fights when questions came up which involved the interests of other parts of the United Kingdom; but this agitation in Scotland cannot fail to have an important influence in maturing public opinion on the Irish question. I maintain that the English Parliament cannot deal efficiently with these questions, that from lack of knowledge and sympathy, in consequence of being, as Mr. Gladstone has said, wholly over-weighted, it is not competent, and its incompetency has been proved and confessed by the present Premier, to deal satisfactorily with these questions. Let the British people then give to the Irish people this legitimate vent for their somewhat restless energies, and utilize them in the legitimate occupation of dealing with their own concerns. I have once again to trouble the House with another extract from a still later speech by Mr. Gladstone. Speaking of Parliament the hon. gentleman said:

“ Sir, this a subject on which I have very distinct and clear opinions, which I have never scrupled to declare. They are not shared by many gentlemen; probably in this House they may be considered of a speculative character, and it is highly unlikely that I shall ever be called upon to take a practical part in any matter relating to these opinions, but I have the very strongest opinions, upon the advantages of Local Government, and I have the strongest objections to the tendency which I see constantly prevailing to centralization. Not for Ireland merely, but for England, I would take and profess it at all points a cardinal rule of policy, so far as I can with safety to the general structure of the Empire, to decentralise Parliament. We believe that the institution of secondary and local authorities in a country is a great source of strength, and that in principle the only necessary limit to these powers is an adequate and necessary provision for the supremacy of the central authority. (Hear, hear.) I believe that when the demand is made from Ireland for bringing purely Irish affairs more specially or more largely under Irish control outside the walls of Parliament the wise way to meet that demand will not be the method recommended by the member for the University of Dublin, who, if I understood him aright, said that anything recognising purely Irish control for purely Irish affairs must be necessarily a step towards separation, and must therefore be fraught with danger. (Opposition cheers.) That I do not believe to be either a wise or a just method of dealing with that demand. In my opinion the wise and the just method is to require that before any such plan can be dealt with or can be examined with the view of being dealt with on its

merits, we must ask those who propose it; and this is the question I have invariably put—“What are the provisions which you propose to make for the supremacy of Parliament.” That has been my course, and that is the course I intend to pursue. I am bound to say I have not received an answer to that question. I have never heard in the time of Mr. Butt or from the mouth of any other gentleman any adequate or satisfactory explanation upon that subject. To this declaration I have only one limitation more to add, and that is I am not prepared to give to Ireland anything which in point of principle it would be wrong to give to Scotland if Scotland ask for it. (Home Rule cheers.) That is, I apprehend, what Irish members, those members of the most popular classes, will be ready to accept. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman was determined to make out that these declarations on my part were a formidable novelty and he said he believed that I had in Mid-Lothian—the scene of so many misdeeds—(laughter)—and likewise at the Guildhall, which might have been considered a more consecrated precinct—delivered opinions of this kind. Well, I cannot recall all the speeches I have delivered on the subject, but I have taken the pains to recall six of them—(laughter)—which seems to me a very tolerable allowance. One was made in 1872 at Aberdeen, when I was Prime Minister. The next was in 1879 in Mid-Lothian, and another was made in the Guildhall in 1881. But the three speeches made out of Parliament were balanced by three made in Parliament, for in 1872 as Prime Minister I made a reply to Mr. Butt precisely in the same spirit of the declarations I have now made, and in the spirit of the sentences I uttered last week. I did the same in 1874, when I was not Prime Minister, but leader of the Opposition, and I did the same thing in 1880, when I sat on these benches as an independent member. Perhaps I may be allowed to read a few words of that speech. My hon. friend the member for Cork (Mr. Shaw), in the beginning of 1880, on the 27th of February, made a remarkable speech upon this question. He made a proposition which I could not accept any more than I could accept the proposition of my hon. friend the member for Tipperary (Mr. P. J. Smyth) the other night, and, professing himself an advocate of what I think he termed Home Rule, argued for it and pleaded for it in a spirit I own won my sympathy and regard, and I did not hesitate, as I do not which now, to use these words. (The hon. gentlemen then quoted the words in which he said that from the tone of the hon. member's remarks, if the relations between England and Ireland were to become satisfactory, the most important contribution to that essential end would have been made by Mr. Shaw.) That was the spirit in which I received the declaration made by the hon. member as leader, for he then was leader of the party from Ireland, and every one of the speeches to which I have referred is, I believe, in complete and exact conformity with the brief outline of my opinions upon this question.”

Now, Sir, I have read that speech for two or three reasons. First of all, because you will observe that the hon. the Prime Minister, after an interval of reflection, comment and criticism reiterates the demand as an essential condition preliminary to any action on this subject, that a satisfactory solution of all these difficulties should be propounded by those who ask for it on the Home Rule benches. Therefore we find the suggestion that it stand until a day which may never come. Secondly, there is a declaration which he says he has made for ten years, and therefore we find no advance in his views upon this question. Lastly, and most importantly, we find him using these same fatal words with which Irish questions, as I have proved, have been always postponed until the day of grace and utility

were passed. This is a practical question. I do not expect to be called upon to deal with it. I care nothing for these speculations. I say it is a practical, a burning question. It is the most practical and burning question we can conceive, and when the Minister has stated that the results are not satisfactory as they stand, that there ought to be a change, that there ought to be a grant of local rights and privileges, that justice demands it, and that it cannot be expected that they will be satisfied if the Parliament of the United Kingdom does not discharge that duty, justice demands that those who have the power and the responsibility should propound that legislation. Now, Sir, I come to the consideration of another branch of this question, and that is whether we have any interest in this question calling upon us to interfere in it, and I deal with that branch of the question now, partly because the hon. gentleman has alluded to it, and partly because it is not the first occasion on which a great Irish question has come under the consideration of this House and has been treated by this House in one way or another. I alluded a while ago to the question of the disestablishment of the Irish Church as one of vast importance both in its direct and indirect relations to the condition of Ireland, and it happened that while that question was under debate a late respected member of this House, the hon. Mr. Holton, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, moved on the 31st of May, 1869 :

“That this House will immediately resolve itself into a Committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:—

“1. That in the opinion of this House the measure now pending before the Imperial Parliament for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church will, if it becomes law, by the removal of one of the chief causes of the deeply rooted discontents which have long existed among a numerous body of Her Majesty's subjects, promote the tranquility, increase the prosperity and add unmeasurably to the strength as well as the just renown of the great Empire of which this Dominion forms no inconsiderable part.

“2. That this opinion is strengthened and supported by the recent experience of the late Province of Canada; for the controversies which had during many years disturbed that Province and retarded its progress were finally and happily terminated in 1854 by an Act of the Provincial Legislature, bearing a close resemblance in its essential features to the measure now before the Imperial Parliament.

“3. That a royal and dutiful address, founded on the foregoing resolutions, be presented to Her Majesty the Queen, and that a Special Committee of Members be appointed to prepare an Address and report the same.”

To this the hon. gentleman moved, seconded by Sir George Cartier, the previous question, and the previous question was upon that occasion carried by the hon. gentleman with the assistance of his supporters, against the vote of the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman supported his motion for the previous question by a speech. He said :

" Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD replied that he did not doubt that the hon. gentleman was influenced by patriotic motives, but it was quite certain that his object was just as mischievous as his mode of bringing it up. The hon. member appeared to give up the whole case when he admitted that, as a matter of legislation, we had no right to deal with it. The Parliament of the Dominion, he acknowledged, was only authorized to pass laws for the good order and peace of Canada. Therefore, the hon. member said that all we could do was to give a simple expression of opinion—nay, more, that we should not do so ordinarily, except on important occasions, or in respect to a matter of supreme necessity. Now, the question immediately suggested itself—Where was the necessity for the present motion? The measure has been approved by the public opinion of Great Britain—it had been sanctioned by an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons, and the hon. gentleman himself had been certain that the House of Lords, in due submission to the popular sentiment, would agree to its passage. Now, surely, it was an extraordinary course on the part of the hon. member to ask the House to deal with a matter with which it had no concern, and render itself amenable to the answers that 'it should mind its own business.' The hon. member acknowledges that our Parliament should not deal with such a matter except in a case of supreme necessity.

" Hon. Mr. HOLTON. I said on a question of supreme importance to the Empire.

" Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no supreme necessity for the motion—it was not of supreme importance to the Empire what our opinions on such a question might be—whether we were favorable or opposed to the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland. The hon. member had asserted that we were in the habit of passing addresses to the Sovereign on matters of interest, affecting herself or family. Now, the Queen of England was the Sovereign of Canada, every one had an interest in herself and family. In the very Act of Confederation, the first clause (sanctioned by the British Parliament), declared that the Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland shall be our own Sovereign for all time to come; and, therefore, it was quite within the limits of our jurisdiction and propriety to refer to matters connected with the propriety and happiness of Her family. The hon. member had also said that we had expressed an opinion respecting peace and war; but every one would see that the moment such a state of things arose, every section of the Empire was virtually affected. Therefore, as loyal and devoted subjects, it was our duty and interest to sympathize with the heart of the Empire. But in the case of the present question, neither our loyalty nor our interest was at stake. He for one would not go into the discussion of the merits of the measure—he would not say whether it was good or not, for it was not the place to debate it. The hon. member had no right to force an expression of opinion in the Canadian Parliament, and he must have known that there was a very considerable and respectable minority in the country immediately affected, who received the Bill with heartburning and the deepest dissatisfaction. The people of Canada lived in harmony and peace—or had no religious or other antipathies to excite us; and yet the hon. gentlemen wished to transfer to the Dominion the heart-burnings and animosities of the Old World. If the policy of the hon. member were sanctioned, then we should see the sad spectacle of different religious sects in this country coming forward, embodying their respective feelings on this vexed question. The hon. member had not even assumed to discuss even the merits of the question—to go into details, and show that it was worthy of the support of the House. Yes, he was calling upon the House to express a decided opinion on a question respecting which it had only a general idea. There could only be one object in such a motion, and that was, to create an ill-feeling between the Protestants and Catholics, to bring discord into this now happy country. It was quite obvious, that if the cause of the course of the hon. member was legitimate, then it would be

within the province of the Legislature to deal with the Reform Bill, and other questions of equal importance affecting Great Britain. On the same principle, the House would be found interfering in the affairs of Spain, and referring to her ecclesiastical establishments. Nay more, the Parliament of the Dominion, with equal justice, might be called upon to give a strong expression of sentiment respecting separate schools, or church endowing, or other matter of interest to the people of Lower Canada. In whatsoever light he viewed the question, he could not avoid seeing the impropriety of the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Chateauguay, and was convinced that the House would deal with it promptly and effectually, so as to prevent the introduction of similar resolutions in the future. In conclusion, he would move the previous question in amendment to the motion before the House."

Now, Sir, I maintain that the hon. gentleman was on that occasion mistaken as to the real feelings and sentiments of the great majority of the Canadian people. I believe that, so far from that motion being, as the hon. gentleman said, calculated to excite discord, heart-burnings and religious difficulties, we would have all agreed—had he but seen the question in another light—in favor of that solution of that question, just as we had, in the old Province of Canada, lively though were the feelings of religious difference in that old Province, when we settled a somewhat similar question. I refer, Sir, to this statement, because I wish to express the hope that in the interval between 1869 and 1882, the hon. gentleman has advanced in his views, has observed the current of events, and will now be disposed to take a different line, and instead of arguing on the precedent which he himself created by moving the previous question on that occasion, as he stated there would be an effectual barrier to similar resolutions in the future, he may be disposed to admit our right to tender some advice on this occasion, and give his support to the motion before the House. I say we have an interest, as a part of the great Empire—as sharers in its prosperity, as sharers in its shame; we have an interest in everything which will tend to develop the strength and the unity of that Empire; we have an interest in every great and important question affecting the general constitution and organization of the Empire at large. Nobody can doubt that, through chaos and without any formal system, the gradual tendency of the constitution of the Empire has been more and more—perhaps through drifting, perhaps otherwise—towards the adoption of the federative form. We ourselves are the outcrop of that idea. Our present position is due to its partial, unsymmetrical, unreasoned, but practical development; and I say, Sir, we must consider that, without power effectually to interfere, without power of legislation, we yet have a right, as

MEMBERS OF THE EMPIRE,

to express an opinion upon this subject. As a part of the Empire largely peopled by old countrymen—by Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen—we have a deep interest in a question which must materially affect the prosperity and happiness of our countrymen in the old land. As a country wanting immigrants, as the hon. gentleman has said, we have a material interest of a very great degree. We all know where the Irish immigration goes; we all know that those who cross the sea and land upon the shores of America, go almost wholly, particularly those of the Roman Catholic faith, to the United States instead of to Canada; we know that our share of the Irish immigration is insignificant, and that our share of Irish Roman Catholic immigration is but a very small proportion in these latter days of even our share of Irish immigration. We know, on the other hand, that enormous numbers of that people have gone to the United States. When I said two years ago that that was due largely to the difficulties to which I referred, and hoped that a better feeling might be engendered by remedial measures

APPLIED TO THE STATE OF IRELAND

hon. gentlemen opposite did not seem to sympathize with that remark. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman repeat it to-day, and I hope it has become, to a large extent, the accepted sentiment of the people of this country. We are interested materially in another sense in this question. We and our neighbors have a common frontier of 3,000 miles long. That country is, and must always be, a country in our cordial and friendly relations with which, must lie a great part of our own prosperity; and no man can doubt that the existence of the Irish question is a main feature of the difficulties between the United Kingdom and the United States, and cannot but react most unfavorably upon us. We recollect what has happened in former days; we recollect when our peace was broken, our territory invaded more than once, expense was incurred and blood shed; we recollect that such a state of things existed in the United States, that redress, whether by expression of regret or by pecuniary compensation, was absolutely denied, on the score, I presume, that the state of feeling in that country rendered it impossible for any such concession to be made. If you look at some of the figures of the recent Census, you will see how directly and indirectly—directly, as wanting immigrants ourselves, indirectly as those with whom the people of the United States should be

ON FRIENDLY TERMS—

we are interested in this question. Take the State of Massachusetts in which out of a population of 1,625,000, the foreign-born people, if I remember rightly, number some 420,000 souls, and of these no less than about 240,000 were born in Ireland; so that more than one-half of the foreign-born population of the State of Massachusetts is of Irish birth, while if you add to those the number who are the descendents of Irishmen in that State, you will see what a powerful factor in the prosperity and the progress of that country is the Irish immigration. Of that immigration we want a share for ourselves and we want still more earnestly that those who choose the Republic instead of the Dominion, shall not choose the Republic with feelings of animosity and disaffection towards the Empire of which we form a part, but with those friendly feelings which animate the Englishmen and Scotchmen who also happen to prefer, for material reasons, the republic to the Dominion. Now, Sir, there is another reason why we should interfere—we can speak with authority on this subject; we are federalists ourselves; we are experienced in the benefits of Home Rule; we know what it means; we know that it is our most precious possession; we know that there is nothing that we will part with with greater reluctance or more difficulty than our

PORTION OF HOME RULE;

we know that there is nothing that we would sacrifice more to retain than our portion of Home Rule, whether you revert to that portion which the Dominion has in relation to the Empire, or that portion which the Provinces have in relation to the Dominion. In reference to the important Federation which exists between Canada and the United Kingdom, or the more perfect form of federation which exists between the Dominion and the Provinces, if any people in the wide world can speak of the difficulties engendered from the want of Home Rule, and the benefits to be secured by the grant of Home Rule, it is the people in whose name and for whose interests we sit and deliberate in this hall this night. Now, Sir, the descendant of Irishmen myself—my grandfather by the father's side a rector of the church to which I have referred, and sleeping in his churchyard, and my ancestor by my mother's side slain in conflict with insurgents, while it might have been my misfortune, had I been born and bred in the old land, to adopt from prejudice views very different from those I hold this night, yet, it having been my good fortune to have been born and bred in the free air of Canada, and to have learned those better, those wiser, those more

Christian and just notions which here prevail, upon the subjects of civil and religious liberty, class legislation, and Home Rule itself, I have always entertained ever since I have had the opportunity of thinking on this subject, the sentiments to which I have given feeble utterance this evening. I believe that these are the sentiments native to our own sense of

FREEDOM AND JUSTICE,

of forbearance and toleration, and a desire to deal in this subject, as the hon. gentleman said who moved it, in that spirit which says: "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you," I had been anxious that this discussion should be raised, and had myself prepared a motion on the subject when private circumstances called me from my desk here. On my return I learnt that the same hon. gentleman to whom the hon. member for Victoria has alluded had taken the matter in hand, and it was thought better not to meddle with them, or with the course that they, under his leadership, might propose. But although I remained silent I felt that it would be doing but a scant justice to the feeling of Canadians, French, Scotch, English or Irish to suppose that there is any material difference in the intensity of their feelings on this subject from those whom the hon. gentleman who brought forward the motion more particularly seems to represent. I believe our sentiments are based on the general principle of political action to which we have been educated and which has advanced our prosperity and our intellectual and moral standing in the world. Now, I heard the hon. gentleman's resolution with some regret, for one reason that I find it emasculated. I find it very much weaker than the resolution which he put on the paper in the first instance. In some particulars it does not legislatively suit my view. He has fallen into something like the error ascribed to Mr. Gladstone, and not willing myself to repeat that error, I would prefer to vote for the best resolution we can get. Yet I

WILL VOTE WITH RELUCTANCE

for the measure which hypothetically refers to the grant of a measure of self-government to Ireland. The hon. gentleman says in the altered resolution:—

"And we would venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, sure means may be found of meeting the expressed desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard.

"6. We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned

in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them."

We have no idea that the rights and interests of the minority will be other than fully protected and secured. I believe that its best security is to be found in a united Irish people, managing their own affairs. I say that the possession of such a measure is essential to the maintenance of the Empire. There ought to be no ifs or ands in the expression of the views of the 'Canadian' people upon this most important subject. It is only upon the theory, only upon the strong view that the possession of such a law is essential to the integrity of the Empire that we can agitate or act with the effect in dealing with this matter. I am not disposed to act hypothetically. I am not disposed to deal with this question with if's and and's. I am willing to advise conciliatory measures and ample justice to Ireland. I should like the Canadian people, through their representatives in Parliament, to say to the Imperial Government, politely, that, in their opinion, as 4,000,000 of British subjects, they believe that, the integrity of the Empire demands

SELF GOVERNMENT FOR IRELAND.

So with reference to the clause that speaks of those men deprived of constitutional right of trial by jury, I do not understand them to invite the clemency of the Crown. I do not understand them to be charged with political offences. I understand them to be imprisoned under a law which does not call on the Government to charge them with any crime whatever. What we ought to have asked for those gentlemen is the restoration of the *habeas corpus* and a trial by their peers of any charge which the Government of England may think fit to make against them. It is not an application for clemency and mercy that they demand and that we should express, but a hope that the ordinary constitutional right of every British subject may be extended to these particular British subjects—namely, the right of *habeas corpus* and of trial by their peers for any offense with which they may be charged against the law of the land to which they belong. I hope that the resolution, weak as it is, unsatisfactory as it is—failing, as in my opinion it does in those two points, in a manner which I do not myself admire, will yet pass; because it is not amendable, and it is infinitely better that it should pass than be rejected because some may think it too weak and others too strong. In this question I have shown we are interested in many ways, although we have no direct voice in the legislation of Great Britain, notwithstanding we have a right to venture our counsel and express our views. We have a right respectfully to

approach our Sovereign and strengthen the hands of Her Prime Minister whose sentiments are not hostile to reform. We have a right to give the influence of 4,000,000 of British subjects to the redress of grievances too long maintained, to attainment of rights too long denied, and so to enlarge the strength and increase the unity of the mighty Empire of which we form a part.

(On sitting down the hon. gentleman received an ovation of applause from both sides of the House.)

The following is the resolution moved by Mr. Costigan to which Mr. Blake spoke:—

That an humble Address be presented to the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, in the following words:—

Most Gracious Sovereign:

We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, desire most earnestly, in our own name, and on behalf of the people whom we represent, to renew the expression of our unswerving loyalty and devotion to Your Majesty's person and Government.

1. We have observed, may it please Your Majesty, with feelings of profound regret and concern, the distress and discontent which have prevailed for some time among Your Majesty's subjects in Ireland.

2. We would respectfully represent to Your Majesty that your Irish subjects in the Dominion of Canada are among the most loyal, most prosperous, and most contented of Your Majesty's subjects.

3. We would further respectfully represent to Your Majesty that the Dominion of Canada, while offering the greatest advantages and attractions for those of our fellow-subjects who may desire to make their homes amongst us, does not receive that proportion of emigrants from Ireland which might reasonably be expected, and that this is due, in a great measure, in the case of many of our Irish fellow-subjects who have sought foreign homes, to their feelings of estrangement towards the Imperial Government.

4. We would further most respectfully represent to Your Majesty, that in the interests of this, your loyal Dominion and of the entire Empire, it is extremely to be desired that Your Majesty may not be deprived in the development of Your Majesty's possessions on this continent of the valuable aid of those of Your Majesty's Irish subjects who may feel disposed to leave their native land to seek more prosperous homes.

5. We desire respectfully to suggest to Your Majesty, that Canada and its inhabitants have prospered exceedingly under a Federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and would venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, sure means may be found of meeting the expressed desire of so many of Your Irish subjects in that regard, so that Ireland may become a source of strength to Your Majesty's Empire, and that Your Majesty's Irish subjects at home and abroad may feel the same pride in the greatness of Your Majesty's Empire, the same veneration for the justice of Your Majesty's rule, and the same devotion to, and affection for, our common flag, as are now felt by all classes of Your Majesty's loyal subjects in this Dominion.

6. We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom be extended to those persons, who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them.

We pray that the blessings of Your Majesty's Reign may, for Your people's sake, be long continued.

er
n.
of
n-
to
ty

on

an

ent

ly,
to
our

of
ave

ish
ost

the
rac-
nes
and
reat
ave
the

ty,
tire
be
hia-
cts
ous

ada
om,
elf-
ent
nd
ay
cts
our
nd
y's
nd
ow

en
he
ed
ole

our

